

WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

VOL. XXVIII.

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., SATURDAY FEBRUARY 23, 1901

NO

The Washington Sentinel.
Published and Edited by
LOUIS SCHADE.
APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.



TERMS
\$3 per year for single copy sent by
mail to subscribers, payable in advance
BATES OF ADVERTISING:

First insertion, one inch, \$1.50; second
insertion, 75 cents. Liberal deductions
for annual advertisements. Special
notices 25 cents a line.
Advertisements for insurance insertion
should be handed in not later than 12
o'clock noon on Thursday.
Office: No. 600 F Street, N. W.,
Washington, D. C.
Sample copies mailed upon applica-
tion. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Wash-
ington D. C.

DUTY NOT PARTY.

The Washington Evening Star, an Administration organ, feels the pulse of public opinion on the subject of a postponement of war tax reduction in the following paragraphs in its issue of Wednesday last:

Among some of the Republican members of the House the opinion is expressed almost with the force of conviction that the bill reducing the war revenue tax will fail in conference. To some extent there is a sentiment strongly in favor of the postponement of tariff reduction until such time as it can be accomplished in a more satisfactory manner. A criticism of proposed legislation, as it appears in conference which is reflected in letters received by members of the House, is the failure to relieve the inconvenience to the public involved in the stamp tax; and it is suggested that if a law is enacted at this time it will be apt to stand for a long time, with all its imperfections, whereas by waiting a little longer a general repeal of the special war tax may be secured.

The opinion is held by some that there will be a permanent deadlock in the conference, and it is said that if the House conference does not yield to the Senate there will be strong opposition on the Republican side of the House to the adoption of the conference report. Unless the matter is brought up immediately in the conference the Democratic vote in the House will figure in the controversy, as it did in connection with the fight over asking the Senate for a conference. The Democrats, while not favoring either the House or the Senate bill, will take the position that there must be a reduction of the War Tax, and will vote for such reduction even if it is unsatisfactory in method and extent. Therefore substantially a solid Democratic vote may be reckoned in support of any conference report or agreement that may be submitted, or in support of a motion to concur in the Senate amendments, if one can be got before the House. If the matter comes before the House in a way to divide the Republicans the Democrats will vote with those who favor an agreement between the two Houses on a bill.

The Democratic position is now and always has been in favor of sweeping reductions in the War Revenue act. If a relief measure fails it will not be for want of sympathy with such a measure on that side of the House. In committee, on the floor of the House, and in private conversation Democrats have advocated the passage of the bill, and their only regret has been that they could not wipe it out entirely.

Why should Republicans hesitate in the performance of their duty in this matter? When the bill was passed brewers were assured by Republican leaders that it was only meant to be temporary, and as soon as the way was clear the double war tax on beer would be repealed. During the course of the campaign Speaker Henderson, at Milwaukee, publicly declared that in the event of McKinley's election the tax would be repealed. In his message to Congress the President advised a revision of the War Revenue bill and suggested that reduction should be made in those provisions of the act which bore most heavily on the industries of the people. Are not these sufficient inducements for them to make it a party measure, if such a thing were necessary?

Upon the assembling of Congress the Ways and Means Committee applied itself to the task of discovering in what lines the measure caused the greatest hardships, and after a patient and thorough investigation decided that beer was entitled to and should receive substantial reductions. In their report they recommended that the tax should be reduced to \$1.60 a barrel. In this shape the bill went to the Senate.

When the Finance Committee of that body presented its report it was found that beer had received a further cut of 10 cents a barrel, making the rate \$1.50, or a total reduction of 25 per cent. The saving to brewers, if the bill had passed in this shape, would have been \$13,700,000—quite a large sum, it is true, but no larger in proportion to the gross reductions than was justified by the share beer had contributed to the revenue bill.

Of the total amount collected under the War Revenue bill beer had paid fully one-third. As the

Reduction bill passed the House, it carried about \$30,000,000, of which sum beer received nearly one-third. The House evidently believed in awarding relief where relief had been found actually needed, and in proportion to the burden borne by the article.

As it passed the Senate the bill carried about \$40,000,000, of which beer was awarded \$13,700,000, or about one-third of the whole. Here again was beer conceded to be entitled to substantial relief, and the figure named is again found to be almost exactly in proportion to the share it contributed towards the war levy—one-third of the whole.

With such unanimity of opinion between the two Houses it would hardly seem possible for relief to be denied. Yet such a danger exists. And it is not caused by any fear that receipts will not justify the reduction made. The surplus in the Treasury from War Revenue taxes on Dec. 31, 1900, was \$130,000,000, a sum large enough to protect the Treasury for three years, not to speak of the additions that will be made to that surplus during the current six months.

Nor is it caused by fear that appropriations by this Congress will preclude reduction. In the House the other day, Chairman Cannon, of the Appropriations Committee, said that the total of appropriations of this session of Congress was \$694,000,000 in round numbers. This showed an apparent increase of \$36,000,000 over last year. To provide for this increase and for the reductions proposed by the Senate bill would require the sum of \$76,000,000. As the surplus for last year was \$79,000,000, and that for the current year is estimated at the same figure, it is plain that the Senate was justified in exceeding the provisions of the House bill and that the Treasury resources will not be impaired by the passage of the Senate measure.

If the reduction granted to tobacco is the obstacle in the path, short work should be made of that provision. As the *SENTINEL* pointed out several weeks ago, when the emergency act of 1893 was passed tobacco manufacturers simply decreased the size of the package sold to consumers, by authority of Congress, and thus saddled their share of the War Revenue bill upon the purchaser, and made a profit of at least 2 cents a pound by the transaction out of the necessities of the Government. They have not contributed one penny to the revenues, and why so much solicitude should be shown now to give them a gratuity of \$9,000,000—for it is nothing less than a gratuity—surpasses comprehension. No injustice will be done by allowing this tax to stand, unless it is to the consumer, and if it is intended to benefit him, let the tax stand anyhow, or cut it in half, and make tobacco contribute something to the Government's extraordinary expense of the past three years, and even up to the consumer by ordering a return to the original size package—two ounces.

The *SENTINEL* has heretofore said that this matter was susceptible of easy settlement—always supposing the presence of a desire to settle. The trouble arose from the incorporation by the Senate of items in a revenue bill—notably those relating to the tobacco and bank check tax—a privilege reserved to the House. The decrease of the beer tax by 10 cents a barrel was within Senatorial rights, as to which while there may be differences on the score of advisability, they should not be permitted to interfere with action on the measure.

Eliminate, then, the disputed points and discuss in calmness the remaining sections. But by all means act—act now. This is not a time for a display of stubbornness nor is the subject one that admits of delay. It is a serious matter for an industry that has been so badly crippled in its efforts to support the Government and it should be treated seriously. Without the beer tax the Treasury would have been driven to a bond issue. To have escaped this expedient was worth millions to the Government in interest charges saved.

Brewers are not asking remission for what they did. They seek only to be relieved of the burden imposed and patiently borne now that the necessity has passed away. Could they ask less? "England expects every man to do his duty today," said Nelson at Trafalgar. The country expects Congress to do its duty now. Let there be no shirkers!

RUSSIA AROUSED.

The news that Russia has put a prohibitory duty on the importation of American iron and steel products and machinery comes as a stunning surprise in the midst of other remarkable events connected with that industry, says the *New York Evening Post*. The reason for this action is that the Treasury Department at Washington believes that Russia grants an export bounty on beet sugar and therefore imposes a countervailing duty on imports of that article from Russia, equal to such bounty, as required by the Dingley act. The fact appears to be that Russia levies a tax on beet sugar consumed at home, but remits the tax on sugar exported to foreign countries. She contends that this is not an export bounty, and so far she is right. We allow distilled spirits to be exported without paying the internal revenue tax. We allow drawbacks of duties on many other articles of export, including refined sugar, but nobody has ever considered these drawbacks as bounties. They are intended merely to give our producers an equal chance in foreign markets, and so long as they do no more, the word bounty is not applicable to them. If Russia has merely refrained from imposing her internal revenue tax on sugar exported, our Government has committed a stupendous error in putting an extra duty on her sugar.

M. de Witte has replied by dealing us the heaviest blow possible. The suddenness and severity of it show that he believes he has justice on his side. Russia is prospectively the largest foreign market for our iron and steel products. We supply her with steel rails and locomotives, dynamos, and an endless variety of machinery. The trade now reaches nearly \$10,000,000 per year. We are building cruisers for her navy. Her empire is the largest undeveloped region in the world occupied by civilized men. Hence, her future market is the largest one in sight. Moreover, it is a market on both oceans, and the one on the Pacific is destined to be the greater of the two. Very likely Manchuria will be added too soon. Until a few days ago our relations with Russia were extremely pleasant. We had cooperated with her in China. She had been our distinctive ally there. We had come to an understanding with her as to the policy of the "open door." We had joined her heartily in the Hague conference. The expressions of friendship on both sides were cordial and genuine, and on the side of Russia all most effusive. Now our traditional friend deals us the hardest blow we have received in the way of trade reprisals since the war of 1812.

As the correspondence has not yet been given to the American public, we must speak somewhat under reserve, yet there are some facts floating on the surface at St. Petersburg and Washington which call for comment. It is said, for example, that M. de Witte has been too hasty; that if he had waited till our General Appraisers and perhaps our Circuit Court and Supreme Court could pass upon the case, our Treasury ruling would, in all probability, have been set aside and the trouble avoided. It is true that no case has yet come before the tribunals. None could arise until after the Treasury ruling had been made and a consignment of sugar had been entered at one of our ports and refused admittance at the ordinary rate of duty. A year or two might then elapse before a final decision would be reached. The idea that a foreign Government should draw distinctions between different departments of our Government and wait to see if the Executive is overruled by the judiciary, is rather whimsical. It becomes more so when we reflect that it is not the sale of a little less sugar that concerns Russia, but what she regards an affront. We have refused to accept her averment that she is not paying a bounty on her exports. We have decided either that she is not telling the truth or that she does not know the true meaning of the word bounty, and we have acted on that presumption by putting an extra tax on her sugar. She replies by a tax in kind on our iron and steel. We import less than \$25,000,000 of Russian sugar per year, we export to her \$10,000,000 of iron and steel and manufactures thereof. The blow we get is by so much worse than the one we struck, and perhaps it will be a good lesson for us. Perhaps it is best we should

learn that two can play at that game.

A tariff war between two countries is foolishness at best. Between two friendly nations it is an abomination. Between the United States and Russia it would have been unimaginable ten days ago. Its consequences are likely to be disastrous all around. It has given a fresh impetus to the project of a European Customs League against the United States. Such a league, if formed, would probably be as short-lived as Napoleon Bonaparte's Continental system against England, but it would inflict great losses on us while it lasted, and might lead to something worse than commercial warfare. Enmities begotten by trade easily grow into national hatred, and are sure to do so if sharpened by a sense of injustice. We trust that Congress will not adjourn without taking some steps toward a readjustment of our good relations with Russia, since it appears that Secretary Gage has no intention of rescinding or modifying his own order. A telegram to the Philadelphia *North American* reports him as saying:

I shall make no new move until there has been a judicial decision on my order. That can be had from the Board of Appraisers two weeks after the first cargo of Russian sugar is landed in this country, if the importers will take an appeal. The Treasury Department wants no delay. It is anxious for a speedy decision. In placing the additional duty on beet sugar I was acting not as a judicial officer. The law specifically makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to place a countervailing duty or tariff on imports whenever it is found that the export of those imports is being encouraged by bounty, either direct or indirect.

He added, according to the same report, that in his belief the Russians could not get along without some of the American articles against which M. de Witte's decree is leveled, and that they would have to buy them at higher prices. This thought will not prove the temper of the Russian Minister when he hears of it.

A Convenient Death Sentence.

The Imperial Government of China is compelled, in accordance with the "peace terms" dictated by the powers, to execute a number of prominent Chinese who took part in the anti-foreign movement. Some of those who are to suffer death are in position to defy the Government and to resist the execution of the sentence. For instance, says the *Baltimore Sun*, there is General Tung Fu Hsiang, who commands a formidable army, is "worshipped by his soldiers" and is influential with the Mohammedan element in the Empire. General Tung Fu Hsiang may be a chivalrous patriot who is willing to die for his country on the field of battle, fighting a foreign foe, but it is quite unlikely that he will permit his head to be chopped off simply to accommodate the Emperor and facilitate a settlement with the powers. The Emperor may issue decrees, but with the army to support him the general will doubtless assert his right to live as long as the state of his health will permit. A Pekin dispatch states that the Emperor has informed several of those whose heads are claimed by the allies that they can commit suicide according to the method which they prefer. General Tung Fu Hsiang will doubtless elect to die of old age, and as long as the soldiers are willing to fight under his banner the Emperor cannot compel him to die by any other method. While making their demands "irrevocable" the allies also imposed impossible conditions upon the Emperor. How is he to inflict the death penalty upon a man who is stronger than the Government, who is in a position to defy the rulers of China, and has thousands of fighting men to protect him from the Government? Gen. Tung Fu Hsiang may be, as it is alleged he is, a murderer and assassin, and may richly deserve to lose his life. Before the allies demanded his head, however, they should have been convinced that the Government had the power to execute the death sentence. If the General refuses to commit suicide and the Emperor is unable to produce his head, what will the powers do? Will there be more punitive expeditions and looting, or will they do the sensible and proper thing and modify their demands? An impossible condition should not be regarded as "irrevocable" anywhere, not even in China.

Now that the Queen is dead, Francis Joseph of Austria holds the record for the longest reign in Europe.

IN SOUTH AFRICA.

An article in the *National Review* for February by H. W. Wilson, under the caption of "A Plea for Reinforcements in South Africa," has a timely interest in view of the invasion of Cape Colony by the Boers under the command of the gallant and skillful De Wet. Mr. Wilson divides the war into three periods. The first was one of continued defeat for the British, and the Empire was shaken to its foundations. The second period was marked by the arrival of strong reinforcements, the invasion of the Boer territories, the seizure of their capitals, the severance of their communications with the outside world, and the capture of two considerable Boer forces. Then the aggressive war, so far as the British were concerned, came to a standstill. In the third period the Boers assumed the offensive, attacking isolated posts with great tact, and now invading Cape Colony.

This stage of the war gives Mr. Wilson great concern, and if the conditions in South Africa are such as he represents them to be, there is substantial cause for the apprehension he expresses. From the beginning of the war, in October, 1899, to December 1, 1900, the British forces dispatched to South Africa were as follows: Regulars, 173,000; yeomanry, 10,915; volunteers, 10,787; militia, 20,626; colonials, including troops raised in South Africa, 40,000; drafts for regulars and militia, 12,500—altogether a total of 267,000 men. Against this overwhelming host were arrayed Boer forces which probably never exceeded 40,000 men, at a liberal estimate, including the armies which besieged Ladysmith, Kimberley and Mafeking and operated in other parts of the two republics and in Cape Colony in the early period of the war.

Of the total British army of 267,000 men Mr. Wilson estimates that only 13,000 effective fighting force at Lord Roberts' disposal at present. The force exceeds 20,000 men. At the beginning of the war about 13,000 British soldiers have been killed in action or have died of wounds and disease; 35,000 sick and wounded have been sent to England; there are 12,000 sick in the hospitals of South Africa, together with 13,800 wounded who are no longer available, while 10,000 un wounded men have returned to their homes. Thus from the army of 267,000 men must be deducted over 80,000, while from the 186,000 left with the colors large deductions must be made for the troops required to guard lines of communication over 4,000 miles long. For this purpose alone 60,000 men were employed before the invasion of Cape Colony, and the number has certainly not been decreased since then. In addition, strong garrisons have to be maintained at important points, such as Johannesburg and Pretoria, and many thousands of colonial troops have obtained their discharge. On the whole, therefore, Mr. Wilson is convinced that the force at Lord Kitchener's command is not large enough to enable him to resume a vigorous offensive campaign against the invaders of Cape Colony.

The situation in South Africa at present seems to be that while the British hold the railways, the small posts which they have established in various parts of the country lie, as Mr. Wilson expresses it, "in a mild state of perpetual siege." Dozens of places are beleaguered of which the public hears nothing because of the strict censorship of all telegrams from South Africa. Nor is the energy of the soldiers what it was at the outset of the war, many of the best and bravest of the men having fallen in battle. The vitality of the survivors is reduced by the constant hardships and short rations, the weeks of forced marches and exposure to cold in winter and heat in summer. Men accustomed to barrack life cannot stand privations like the Boers, who practically spend their lives in the open air and are mured to hardships.

Under these circumstances it would seem that the Boer invasion of Cape Colony is not the foolhardy enterprise which it might have been under different conditions. General De Wet is doubtless as well informed about the obstacles with which Lord Kitchener has to contend as Mr. Wilson, or the British War Office, or that matter. If Lord Kitchener were able to concentrate large forces against De Wet, the Boer leader

would probably not have ventured into Cape Colony. But Kitchener must protect his line of communications at all hazards, and he must maintain strong garrisons at important points. Even with the British force at Johannesburg the Boers are able to attack the mining property on the Rand with success, as was shown by the damage inflicted recently upon the Klockfontein mine. De Wet was apparently justified in assuming that the British had their hands full in keeping open their communications and holding the most important points in the two republics. His raid into Cape Colony, while unquestionably a daring and dangerous enterprise—in fact, almost a forlorn hope—may lead to important results.

Mr. Wilson insists that the British army in South Africa must be reinforced by at least 40,000 men in order to bring the war to a close. At the very most it does not appear that the Boers have more than 15,000 men in the field at present. In military circles in London, according to the latest dispatches, a feeling of optimism prevails, based upon the confidence that at the war will end by July 1. Such a prospect justifies little optimism. If the Boers are not crushed before July 1, Britain's final triumph will be almost as costly as defeat. The British debt has already been increased by \$500,000,000, and five months more of war will add \$150,000,000 to the costs of the campaign. The dead number 13,000 and the list of victims will grow steadily larger as the war continues. If the Boers have not "staggered humanity," they have at least dealt a heavy blow to British prestige; they have killed thousands of the best soldiers in the British army, and they have imposed on British taxpayers burdens which the latter must bear for many years.

The New Philippine Policy.

It is too early yet to judge of the effects of the new military policy in the Philippines—the transportation to Guam of the insurgent leaders, military and civil, and the announcement by Gen. McArthur of a more rigid enforcement hereafter of the laws of war. With the twenty-six persons whose deportation has been ordered out of the way, especially with the removal of the insurgent agents, "the insurrection will be deprived of the fuel which has been keeping it alive," the *Manila Times* predicts. Deportation has been threatened for weeks, and the proclamation of the Governor General regarding the laws of war has been scattered broadcast daily, but there has been no apparent diminution in the activity of the insurgents in the field, or in the energy of their more important agents in Manila and elsewhere who furnish the sinews of war.

All manner of means have been adopted by the wily Filipinos for the filling of the war chest, the most novel yet unearthed by the secret service being that of a band occupying a richly furnished house in the city, where, by stage make-up and ventriloquism, one of the party impersonated the Saviour and another the Virgin Mary. "Divine" commands were given to the superstitious Filipinos as to what they should do to expel the American invaders, and large quantities of money and supplies were obtained. According to a local paper, this band has been sending to the interior insurgents from \$10,000 to \$50,000 a month, besides much linen, tobacco, and other merchandise. How the military lines were crossed with these supplies is not explained, but it is quite evident that military severity is no match for Filipino cunning. The insurgents are found even in the employ of the military government, and recently it was discovered that the boilers of the United States steamer Pampanga had been tampered with by native mechanics, engaged in making repairs on the vessel. Had the plot not been discovered, the vessel might have been destroyed by the explosion of her boilers.

Numbers of natives have taken the oath of allegiance to the United States. Members of the Civil Commission, and the high officers of the army make much of the "submission" of the natives, but it has been the experience of the soldiers that the "amigos" can render as much service to the Filipino cause after swearing allegiance to the United States as before. Indeed, their professed loyalty may free them from a scrutiny which might interfere with their plans.

FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading European papers for the *SENTINEL*.

ENGLAND.

Queen Victoria and Napoleon III.

Charles Benham, in the *Daily Mail*.

"It is very strange; but the Emperor knows everything I have done and where I have been ever since I was twelve years old; he even recollects how I was dressed, and the details of it is extraordinary he should be acquainted with."

Her Majesty was right. It was extraordinary. But then Louis Napoleon was anything but an ordinary man. Naturally she never saw him through those hungry years of his in London, when he hung about the purlieu of King Street, St. James's, with often not the price of a dinner in his pocket, nor even a clean shirt. When in exiled spirits, he sought the bachelors of Holland House and Lady Blessington; places and people Her Majesty may be supposed to have known little about, since they belonged to another world.

But though Queen Victoria knew nothing of Louis Napoleon, it is certain that Louis Napoleon knew a great deal about Queen Victoria. She was in the scheme of his existence, part of that reward of Royal recognition which he meant to claim with the throne of France. His contemporaries of those France days have left it on record that whenever he was particularly glum, they could guess at once that he had caught a glimpse of the young Queen.

The Chartist riots in the spring of 1848 gave him such an opportunity as he at least never disdained. He was able to show his gratitude for hospitality received—a gratitude not so marked, perhaps, on a later occasion. He allowed himself to be sworn in as a special constable; most of us know the nature of him in the top hat and swallowtail of the policemen of those days—with the truncheon hanging from his waist, and leaning nonchalantly against a lamppost. An incident equally well known relates to his visit to London as a Sovereign. When his carriage was passing through King Street, he rose up and pointed out to his wife the house in which he had lodged. And the crowd cheered.

The Empress Eugenie also lived many years in England before her marriage; in the neighborhood of Bath, to be precise. Now did the Queen and Miss Montijo ever meet, nor was there any reason why they should; but the halo of romance surrounding the young girl called to a lonely throne cannot but have affected all her own sex who were within reach of the newspapers, with their daily accounts of so much grace and distinction.

Well, the man of destiny made his attempt once and a second time with his straw eagle and his little knot of devoted adherents, until, like all men who know their own minds and the tumultuous millions of those who don't, he came at last into the Tuileries. That was in 1852, and three years later he and his Empress paid the historic visit to Windsor, a visit which dates the commencement of a friendship only ended by death. In August of the same year Her Majesty and the Prince Consort paid a rare visit to Paris; and it was after that that she made use of the words quoted above, expressive of her surprise that the Emperor should have known everything that she had done and everywhere she had been since she was twelve years old. For Napoleon this interchange of visits meant a diplomatic triumph. It was the first substantial recognition of his new dignity: up till then he had had no opportunity of addressing any monarch as cousin, or exchanging the Royal kiss.

The Queen, on her side, had also had but little experience of such visitors either. The tone of equality, delicately blended with an immensity of homage brought the Emperor rapidly into favor. The Empress Eugenie made no attempt at equality, but accorded the Queen the respect due from one who had been a private citizen to one who was born in the purple. So she, too, made an immediate conquest. From that moment, whatever the political relations between France and England, the Queen never varied from her personal friendship towards the Imperial pair. * * * Probably no woman similarly circumstanced ever found so devoted, or loyal a friend as the ex-Empress did in more than one member of the English Royal family.

There are those in France who will tell you that the Prince Imperial's death in South Africa was but the tragic termination of a deep laid scheme on the part of England to restore him to his throne. The truth, however, seems very different. His mother, it is almost certain, had refused his repeated requests to participate in the fighting—had not only refused, but had used her influence with the Royal Family, including the Duke of Cambridge, at that time Commander in Chief, to have every obstacle put in the young man's way. Accordingly, he had relinquished the idea, until by chance, in the street, he fell in with a friend who had been a fellow cadet at Woolwich, and who was under orders to proceed to the Cape. That finished him. He went straightway round to the Horse Guards, and pleaded so earnestly that the matter was settled before his mother knew anything about it. If he had come through the campaign, and had married an English princess, as was most certainly intended, who can say but at this moment Napoleon the Fourth might not have been ruling in France? But those are among the "might have been" of history. The realities can get no further than the astuteness of an extraordinary man and the friendship of two women, united in their widowhood and in their loneliness.

Aces of the King.

Despite the critical school, we are now learning not to despise tradition. Mingled with a true proportion of fact, it supplies us with some remarkable results when applied to the royal pedigree. For instance, few are perhaps aware that His Majesty can trace descent from Gygis the Lydian and Cyrus the Great. Now this is the way it is done. Fourth from Gygis in descent came Croesus, King of Lydia, who had a sister named Arneses. She married Astyages, King of Media, whose granddaughter Bardane married Cyrus the Great, B. C. 559. Of these two was descended Artaxerxes Menon, King of Persia, of whom came Arsaces Magnus Tiridates, King of Parthia; from whom Tiridates, King of Armenia; and of this house Basil, the Macedonian Emperor of Constantinople, claimed descent. A descendant of his was Luigarda, daughter of Basil II, Emperor of the East, who married Arnolph, Count of Holland. From him the line is through the royal house of France to Isabel of Angoulême who married King John of England, of whom the King is descended in the female line.

Further back than this the unblushing genealogist will probably hesitate to proceed, though there have been those who did it a flinch from tracing the royal house back to Noah through the ancient House of Norway, to say nothing of Eldrid, King of Britain, B. C. 250, and the wonderful French pedigree leading to Antenor, King of the Cimmerians, B. C. 443; while at the elaborate ingenuity of the Irish pedigree to Noah through Magog and Japhet even the most robust imagination stands aghast. O more genuine interest, however, is the traditional strain leading from the house of the Emperor Trajan. Theodosius, Emperor of the East, claimed descent from the family of Ulpian Trajanus, though not, of course, from the great Emperor himself. Of him was descended Eudoxia, married first to Valentinian III, and afterwards to Genseric the Vandal (a mistake probably for Eudoxia, the daughter, who actually did marry Huneric, the son of Genseric), whence came Desiderius, who married Dieteric of the line of Hardeke the Saxon, direct male ancestor of his present Majesty.

It is not necessary, however, to tread on such doubtful ground to find many characters of interest among the ancestors of the royal house. Charles IX, of course, led back by more than one channel Kurier, founder of the Russian Empire, sends a trickle of blood through the royal houses of Poland, Bohemia and France. Emperor Nicholas and Michael I., through the Counts of Cleve; Theodoros Lascaris, through the royal house of Hungary, which in itself brings a descent from Attila the Hun, and the Emperor Honorius; the Comnens and Angeli, through the house of Navarre; while a thousand other royal families add their drops to the stream.

German Eyes on England.

Liverpool Daily Post, Jan. 20.

The German people are now watching the course of events in England with interest as great and hopes as high as were entertained here when the death of the Czar brought the royal families of England and Russia into exceptionally intimate relationship, and appreciate as fully as the Kaiser himself the significance of the honors that are being conferred on their Emperor by the King. The lesson to be learned from these marks of close friendship is too clear to be misunderstood. It is obvious to the Dutch in South Africa, who perceive now more clearly than ever they did before that any hope of German intervention, founded upon either the Kaiser's sympathy or policy, must be abandoned. That present events will not be without influence both upon the German and the English peoples may be confidently predicted. Commercial rivalry will continue, but the acerbity of political feeling will be assuaged. If in addition to closer relations with Germany the King's relations with the Emperor of the Caucasus are to break down jealousies and antipathies between Great Britain and Russia, then, indeed, the outlook in all Europe and Asia would be immensely improved.

Liverpool Mercury, Jan. 20.

It is not likely that the consanguinity of the two imperial houses is one of the factors which govern the mutual attitude of the two nations. There is no reason for thinking that the cooperation between the British and German Governments at the present time is warmer and closer than the relations which would be suggested by the popular feeling. It is not probable that the existence of this consanguinity is due either to Lord Salisbury or to Count von Buelow, and one is led to infer that it is the work of the reigning families. One of the St. Petersburg papers contends that the refusal of the Kaiser to receive Mr. Kruger at Berlin was inspired by Germany's need of an English alliance in order to assume a predominant position in the Balkans, Asia Minor and the Far East. What may be Germany's designs in these extensive regions there is no means of knowing; but it may be conjectured that the Kaiser's treatment of the Boer pilgrim came from his own initiative and not from his Government. * * * It can scarcely be doubted that, if the Emperor had left the arrangements for Mr. Kruger's reception to his Chancellor, a visit to Potsdam would have been the result. But in a matter of this kind the Kaiser could legitimately consult his own inclinations, and Mr. Kruger was duly informed that his Majesty was "not at home." * * * The strong personality of the Emperor and the amiable qualities of our King have both to be taken into account; and though neither could lead England or Germany to engage in an offensive alliance, they may help to prevent a mutual quarrel.